UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/819,291	03/28/2001	Kiyoshi Ozaki	1508.65377	6868	
Patrick G. Burr	7590 03/13/2007	EXAMINER			
GREER, BURI	NS & CRAIN, LTD.	NGUYEN, HOAN C			
300 South Wac Chicago, IL 60	ker Dr., Suite 2500 606	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
5 <b>305</b> 0, <b>12</b> 00			2871		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
09/819,291		OZAKI ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	HOAN C. NGUYEN	2871		
		20, .		

•		HOAN C. NGUYE	:N	28/1					
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio	on appea	rs on the cover	sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 02 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE	E THIS A	APPLICATION IN	CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	•				
this application, applicant must timely file one of the places the application in condition for allowance; (	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the followed.								
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	of this Ac	dvisory Action, or (2)	) the date set forth						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either bo TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See I	MPEP 70	6.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Thave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the periunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Ofmay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR NOTICE OF APPEAL	riod of exte te of the sl ffice later	ension and the corre hortened statutory p	esponding amount eriod for reply orig	of the fee. The appropr jinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	any exten	ision thereof (37 (	CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rej  (a) They raise new issues that would require fur  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NO'  (c) They are not deemed to place the application	irther con	nsideration and/or w);	search (see NC	TE below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canc					110 133400 101				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 C			Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje			_1.	Carl Eladamanda	4				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou non-allowable claim(s).									
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendmen how the new or amended claims would be rejecte. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 40-42.	ed is prov			iii be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-5 and 3	<u>89</u> .								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				lation of Annual will a	at he antered				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final ac because applicant failed to provide a showing of was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	good and	t before or on the discrimination of the sufficient reason	s why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date entered because the affidavit or other evidence fa showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is not shown to be a sufficient reasons.	ailed to o ecessary	vercome <u>all</u> reject and was not ear	tions under appe lier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An expension of the production of th	planation	n of the status of t	he claims after o	entry is below or attac	hed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered See Continuation Sheet.	dered bu	t does NOT place	the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem 13. Other:	ment(s). (	(PTO/SB/08) Pape	er No(s)						
•									

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner does respond to election of restriction on Final rejection (04/17/2006). In the supplemental amendment D based on this Final rejection, applicants have agreed with response to election of restriction; therefore, claims 1-5 and 39 have been marked "withdrawn".

In Response E filed on 2/2/2007, applicants pointed out that Amendment filed on 11/21/2005 (not 11/14/2005) directed to Fig. 17B showing all the features from claim 40. However, Figs. 16-17 in example 1 shows that TWO disconnection repairing contact holes 203/205 are connected to each other by TWO conducting films 209/211, but not a (one) fourth conductive film as claim cited.

Applicants also pointed out that "conducting films 209/211 are simply never described to be necessarily formed from two separate conductive films" that means conducting film can be one film (see attachment), there is no such description of one conducting film filling "the disconnection repairing contact holes so as to reach a surface of the transparent glass substrate" in the specification. However, Example 2 shows (Fig. 18-19) that the one conducting film filling "the disconnection repairing contact holes" that do not reach a surface of the transparent glass substrate.

## Examiner considers two features:

\* two conductive film filling the two the disconnection repairing contact holes so as to reach a surface of the transparent glass substrate in example 1 (Fig. 17 shows each conductive film fills each contact hole).

\* one conductive film filling the two the disconnection repairing contact holes that do not reach a surface of the transparent glass substrate in example 2 (Fig. 19). being two independent features which CANNOT MIXED, and even one skilled in the art cannot combine.

Applicant further argued that "the fourth conductive film is comprised of "a single unitary structure" which is unclear what is "unitary structure", and ""the fourth conductive film is comprised of a plurality of separated discrete portions" which is unclear what is separated portions". However, these are not a claim feature; therefore, the argument is irrelevant.

Claim cited "a fourth conductive film", where in the context, "a" cannot mean more than one as stated in the response (page 7). However, if "a" means "more than one" as Federal Circuit held, "a fourth conductive film" cannot fill both contact holes; it means that "a fourth conductive film" fills one contact hole and "another fourth conductive film" may fill the other contact hole (each conductive film fills each contact hole).



Attachment

FIG.16

